## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/773,843	HUNT ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	JAMES ZURITA	3625		
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>29 February 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
<ol> <li>The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apper for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:</li> </ol>	the same day as filing a Notice of A replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited al (with appeal fee) in compliance w	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires <u>6 mont</u> months from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ai no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.13 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
NOTICE OF APPEAL  2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complifiling the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further core (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a content of the con	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w); ter form for appeal by materially rec	E below); ducing or simplifying the		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).  4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):  6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of	
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>				
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> <li>The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation</li> </ol>	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a ).	
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but		•		
See Continuation Sheet.  12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). ( 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet.	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)			
	/james zurita/ 06/30/08			

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: request is not persuasive; comments concerning inplicit assumptions not persuasive, since limitations from disclosures are not read into the claims. Linden discloses: identifying one or more items from the plurality of items that have ratings similar to the particular item, as in Col. 1, lines 42-46; see also Col. 5, lines 48-56 concerning usage of ratings data for generating recommendations; identifying one or more other users that have given ratings to the one or more items that are substantially similar to ratings given by the particular user to the one or more items; (Linden, Col. 8, lines 35-49, see also Col. 8, lines 12-25, users' [plural] item ratings [plural] profiles [plural] to generate personal recommendations; and generating an estimation of how the particular user would rate the particular item based upon ratings for the particular item given by the one or more other users Col. 2, lines 33-44..

Continuation of 13. Other: there are no amendments to the claims; applicant merely argues concerning perceived differences with Linden.